



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/996,845	11/29/2001	Jai P. Menon	BELL-0169/01414	6405
38952	7590	08/24/2004	EXAMINER	
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			JASMIN, LYNDIA C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3627	

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/996,845

Applicant(s)

MENON ET AL.

Examiner

Lynda Jasmin

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Oath/Declaration

1. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

Non-initialed and/or non-dated alterations have been made to the oath or declaration. See 37 CFR 1.52(c).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requires of this title.

3. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The basis of this rejection is set forth in a two-prong test of:

- (1) whether the invention is within the technological arts; and
- (2) whether the invention produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

For a claimed invention to be statutory, the claimed invention must be within the technological arts. Mere ideas in the abstract (i.e., abstract idea, law of nature, natural phenomena) that do not apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts fail to promote the "progress of science and the useful arts" (i.e., the physical sciences as opposed to social sciences, for example) and therefore are found to be non-statutory

Art Unit: 3627

subject matter. *For a process claim, the recited process must somehow apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts.*

In the present case, claim 1 only recites an abstract idea. The recited steps of merely receiving request at a centralized agent of an organization for a resource and selecting a vendor capable of supplying the resource do not apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts since all of the recited steps can be performed in the mind of the user or by use of a pencil and paper. These steps only constitute an idea of how to select a vendor in an organization having a plurality of entities.

Additionally, for a claimed invention to be statutory, the claimed invention must produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result. In the present case, the claimed invention of receiving request at a centralized agent of an organization for a resource (i.e., repeatable), reviewing and selecting the best vendor capable of supplying the resource, and producing agreement with the selected vendor (i.e., useful and tangible).

Although the recited process produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result, since the claimed invention, as a whole, is not within the technological arts as explained above, claims 1-17 are deemed to be directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Putt (2003/0097296 A1).

As best understood, Putt discloses the claimed method the method for acquiring a resource for at least one of a plurality of entities (via clients 24) with the steps of:

receiving, at a centralized agent (via provider organizations 30) of an organization (within a client organization 20), a request for the resource (via request for project 22) from at least one of the entities (24),

reviewing, by the centralized agent (via system 10), each request for the resource (via evaluating each project), selecting a vendor (via selecting a service provider 32) capable of supplying the resource of the request to the organization (box [0101]), designating at least one individual from the organization to work with the selected vendor in developing and supplying the resource of the request (box [0152]), producing a qualified request to be submitted to the selected vendor (box [0153-0166]), submitting the qualified request to the selected vendor (box [0168], producing an agreement with the selected vendor regarding terms (via defining parameters by which they shall perform the engagement), reviewing the produced agreement in view of the qualified request and approving same, the selected vendor thereafter undertaking to develop and supply the resource of the qualified request according to the approved agreement (box [0196]), and monitoring progress of the selected vendor according to the produced and approved agreement (box [062]).

Putt further discloses receiving a statement of need that includes information necessary for the centralized agent to act upon the request (via specifying request for proposal) and aggregating similar requests for concurrent handling (box [0096]).

Putt further discloses the centralized agent selecting the vendor based on at least one of a suggestion in the request, on a bidding procedure, on experience, on ability to supply the organization for the resource, and on a pre-existing relationship between the organization and the vendor (matching service providers, see box [0150]).

Putt also discloses the steps of producing the agreement includes the selected vendor and the designated individual working together to reach agreement regarding

such terms (via negotiation terms of the proposal for the project, box [0201]), the selected vendor and the designated individual defining milestones and criteria that must be satisfied in developing and supplying the resource (box [0221]), reviewing the produced agreement in terms of a member of a group consisting of cost, terms, ability to satisfy needs of the organization, and combinations thereof (see boxes [0187-0194]).

Although, Putt fails to explicitly disclose that the designation of at least one individual from the organization to work with the selected vendor, is performed by the centralized agent. However this feature is inherently recited. Putt discloses that the system 10 initiates a collaborative environment wherein participants manage project request lifecycle. Thus, since the system (10) provide a framework for receiving and evaluating request it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to have provided the system of Putt with the designation of a project participant since such would only allow the system to assign which participant, within the client organization, is best fit to supervise a specific project and the Examiner takes Official Notice as such.

Further, Putt does not explicitly disclose performing a periodic review to determine whether each milestone and criteria is satisfied and periodically re-assessing the qualified request for the resource to determine whether the qualified request is still valid in view of whether needs of the organization have changed. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the periodic review in the system of Putt such would only be part in managing the project lifecycle.

Conclusion


7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Shaw discloses a method for allocating resources of an organization. Maritzen et al. discloses using an intelligent agent to determine whether a product and service satisfies preferences establish by a party. Stoxen et al. discloses a centralized acquisition utility for facilitating event requests for multiple clients. McKnight et al. discloses a method for providing distributed computing services via a system manager. Shay et al. discloses receiving a request, via a computer assisted method, to allocate resources within an organization.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lynda Jasmin whose telephone number is (703) 305-0465. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday (8:00-5:30) alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert P Olszewski can be reached on (703) 308-5183. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Lynda Jasmin
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3627

lj